

REMARKS

In the action of December 14, 2004, the examiner objected to the drawings relative to the subject matter of claims 5, 9, 10 and 11; rejected claims 1, 4-13, 16-18 and 28 under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Munk *et al*; and rejected claim 14 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Munk *et al*. The examiner allowed claims 22-25 and indicated that claims 15 and 19-21 contained allowable subject matter.

First, a set of new drawings is submitted with the additional figures showing the subject matter of claims 5 and 9-11. The new figures, which are informal, will be followed by formal counterparts.

In response, applicants have amended claims 1 and 28 to further clarify the invention. Note that in each of those claims, applicants have clarified that an appliance driving member rotates in operation and provides rotational motion to a second member. The driving member is fitted to the second member in such a manner that as the driving member rotates, the second member rotates therewith.

Claims 1 and 28 are patentably distinguished over the reference to Munk *et al*. Munk discloses a keel joint between a riser extending from a fixed well head on an ocean floor and a hull of a floating platform. The examiner refers to Figure 6 of Munk in the action. Applicants' claims (1 and 28) call for a "first member" to be fixably attached to an appliance body member. An "appliance driving member" rotates a "second member" relative to the first member. With respect to claim 1, the lower member of the Munk keel joint is element 124 (not 120). Please note that element 124 is not secured to an appliance or in fact any element. Further, the driving member (riser 14) and the second member 122 of Munk are not fitted together in such a manner that if riser 14 would rotate, the member 122 would rotate therewith. Riser member 14 in Munk does not rotate and hence does not (and could not) rotate the second member 122 relative to element 124.

In fact, the Munk keel joint has nothing to do with rotational action. Rather, it is angular action of the riser relative to the hull of the platform which is significant. Angular means motion in the plane of Figure 6, as opposed to rotational action which is about an axis which is in the plane of Figure 6. The platform hull moves laterally relative to riser 14, which motion is accommodated by the structure of Figure 6, in particular spokes 126 and 128, which extend between element 122 and elements 120

(upper) and elements 124 (lower), respectively. The keel joint structure bends to accommodate relative movement between the riser and the platform hull. It does not rotate and then provide a return force.

With respect to claim 28, upper member 120 (not labeled in Figure 6) is secured to an outer keel joint sleeve 126. Again, however, riser 14 is not designed to rotate and does not rotate the second member 122 relative to upper member 120. The joint is designed to bend, not rotate. Even if riser 14 rotated, member 122 would not rotate therewith. Riser 14 would simply slide within member 122. The purpose of the device of Figure 6 is to permit angular movement between riser 114 and the hull 22 of the platform, not rotational movement. The elastomer spokes permit that angular movement. Riser 14 cannot rotate member 122. Further, note that there is nothing holding the first member in place to the extent that if the second member were rotated (which it does not in the embodiment shown), it would rotate relative to the fixed position of the first member. Hence, claim 28 is also patentable over Munk.

In view of the above, independent claims 1, 27 and 28 are allowable. Since claims 4-19 are dependent upon claim 1, and since claims 23-25 are dependent on claim 22, those claims are also allowable. Allowance of the application is thus respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By Clark A. Puntigam
Clark A. Puntigam, #25,763
Attorney for Applicant

CAP:gh
206 448-3200
FAX: 206 441-5514
E-mail: clark@jensenpuntigam.com
Enclosures: Drawings (5 sheets), Postcard